

August 1, 1996, Friday, August 2, 1996, or Saturday, August 3, 1996, pursuant to a motion made by the majority leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until noon on Wednesday, September 4, 1996, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, August 1, 1996, Friday, August 2, 1996, Saturday, August 3, 1996, or Sunday, August 4, 1996, pursuant to a motion made by the majority leader or his designee in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, September 3, 1996, or until such time on that day as may be specified by the majority leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 2. The Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the minority leader of the House and the minority leader of the House and the minority leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] seek recognition?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I would Mr. Speaker, if the resolution were debatable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, the resolution is not debatable.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 167, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 368]

YEAS—232

Allard	Burton	Deal
Archer	Buyer	DeLay
Armey	Callahan	Diaz-Balart
Bachus	Calvert	Dickey
Baker (CA)	Camp	Doolittle
Ballenger	Campbell	Dornan
Barr	Canady	Dreier
Barrett (NE)	Castle	Duncan
Bartlett	Chabot	Dunn
Barton	Chambliss	Ehlers
Bass	Chenoweth	Ehrlich
Bateman	Christensen	English
Bereuter	Chrysler	Ensign
Bilbray	Clinger	Everett
Bilirakis	Coble	Fawell
Bliley	Collins (GA)	Fields (TX)
Blute	Combest	Flanagan
Boehlert	Condit	Foley
Boehner	Cooley	Forbes
Bonilla	Cox	Fowler
Bono	Crane	Fox
Brewster	Crapo	Franks (CT)
Brownback	Creameans	Franks (NJ)
Bryant (TN)	Cubin	Frelinghuysen
Bunn	Cunningham	Frisa
Bunning	Davis	Funderburk
Burr	de la Garza	Galleghy

Ganske	Lightfoot	Royce
Gekas	Linder	Salmon
Gilchrest	Livingston	Sanford
Gillmor	LoBiondo	Saxton
Gilman	Longley	Schaefer
Goodlatte	Lucas	Schiff
Goodling	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Goss	Martini	Shadegg
Graham	McCollum	Shaw
Greene (UT)	McCrery	Shays
Greenwood	McHugh	Shuster
Gutknecht	McInnis	Sisisky
Hancock	McIntosh	Skeen
Hansen	McKeon	Smith (MI)
Hastert	Metcalf	Smith (NJ)
Hastings (WA)	Meyers	Smith (TX)
Hayworth	Mica	Smith (WA)
Hefley	Miller (FL)	Solomon
Heineman	Molinari	Souder
Herger	Montgomery	Spence
Hilleary	Moorhead	Stearns
Hobson	Morella	Stockman
Hoekstra	Myers	Stump
Hoke	Myrick	Talent
Horn	Neumann	Tate
Hostettler	Ney	Tauzin
Houghton	Norwood	Taylor (NC)
Hunter	Oxley	Thomas
Hyde	Packard	Thornberry
Inglis	Parker	Tiahrt
Istook	Paxon	Torkildsen
Jacobs	Payne (VA)	Traficant
Johnson (CT)	Peterson (MN)	Upton
Johnson, Sam	Petri	Vucanovich
Jones	Pickett	Walker
Kasich	Pombo	Walsh
Kelly	Porter	Wamp
Kim	Portman	Watts (OK)
King	Pryce	Weldon (FL)
Kingston	Quinn	Weldon (PA)
Klug	Radanovich	Weller
Knollenberg	Ramstad	White
Kolbe	Rangel	Whitfield
LaHood	Regula	Wicker
Largent	Riggs	Wilson
Latham	Roberts	Wolf
LaTourette	Rogers	Young (AK)
Lazio	Rohrabacher	Zeliff
Leach	Ros-Lehtinen	Zimmer
Lewis (CA)	Roth	
Lewis (KY)	Roukema	

NAYS—167

Abercrombie	Fattah	Luther
Ackerman	Fazio	Maloney
Andrews	Fields (LA)	Manton
Baessler	Filner	Markey
Baldacci	Flake	Mascara
Barcia	Foglietta	Matsui
Barrett (WI)	Frank (MA)	McCarthy
Becerra	Frost	McDermott
Beilenson	Furse	McHale
Bentsen	Gephardt	McKinney
Bishop	Geren	McNulty
Bonior	Gibbons	Meehan
Borski	Gonzalez	Meek
Browder	Gordon	Menendez
Brown (CA)	Green (TX)	Millender
Brown (FL)	Gutierrez	McDonald
Brown (OH)	Hall (OH)	Minge
Bryant (TX)	Hall (TX)	Mink
Cardin	Hamilton	Moakley
Clay	Harman	Mollohan
Clayton	Hefner	Moran
Clement	Hilliard	Nadler
Clyburn	Hinchev	Neal
Coburn	Hoyer	Oberstar
Collins (MI)	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Conyers	Jackson-Lee	Olver
Costello	(TX)	Ortiz
Coyne	Jefferson	Orton
Cramer	Johnson (SD)	Owens
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Danner	Johnston	Pastor
DeFazio	Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)
DeLauro	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Dellums	Kennedy (MA)	Poshard
Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)	Rahall
Dicks	Kennelly	Reed
Dingell	Kildee	Richardson
Dixon	Klecza	Rivers
Dooley	Klink	Roemer
Doyle	LaFalce	Rose
Durbin	Lantos	Roybal-Allard
Edwards	Levin	Rush
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Eshoo	Lipinski	Sanders
Evans	Lofgren	Sawyer
Farr	Lowey	Schroeder

Schumer	Tanner	Volkmer
Scott	Taylor (MS)	Ward
Serrano	Tejeda	Waters
Skaggs	Thompson	Watt (NC)
Skelton	Thornton	Waxman
Slaughter	Thurman	Wise
Spratt	Torres	Woolsey
Stark	Towns	Wynn
Stenholm	Velazquez	Yates
Stokes	Vento	
Stupak	Visclosky	

NOT VOTING—34

Baker (LA)	Gunderson	Nussle
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bevill	Hayes	Peterson (FL)
Blumenauer	Holden	Quillen
Boucher	Hutchinson	Scarborough
Chapman	Laughlin	Seastrand
Coleman	Lincoln	Studds
Collins (IL)	Martinez	Torricelli
Doggett	McDade	Williams
Ewing	Miller (CA)	Young (FL)
Ford	Murtha	
Gejdenson	Nethercutt	

□ 1148

Mr. YATES and Mr. HALL of Ohio changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3448, SMALL BUSINESS JOB PROTECTION ACT 1996

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3448) to provide tax relief for small businesses, to protect jobs, to create opportunities, to increase the take home pay of workers, to amend the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 relating to the payment of wages to employees who use employer owned vehicles, and to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rate and to prevent job loss by providing flexibility to employers in complying with minimum wage and overtime requirements under that act, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORKILDSEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. CLAY

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLAY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 3448 be instructed to report as soon as possible their resolution of the differences between the Houses, because the minimum wage is at its lowest real value in 40 years and because working families deserve a raise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule XXVIII, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a motion to instruct conferees. We have spent this morning debating a bill that will jeopardize overtime pay for working Americans. More and more workers rely on overtime pay just to make ends meet, yet Republicans insist on passing legislation that will weaken a worker's right to time and a half pay for overtime.

The House's action today makes it even more necessary that we act quickly to enact an increase in the minimum wage. An increase to the minimum wage will provide simple justice for working men and women.

We offer talk about the importance of getting people off welfare. If we are serious about that, if we really want to get people off welfare as opposed to just talking about it, there is one simple way to do that—make work pay.

Almost two-thirds of the minimum wage workers are adults, while 4 in 10 are the sole breadwinner of their family.

Recent studies suggest that 300,000 would be lifted out of poverty if the minimum wage were raised to \$5.15 per hour. This includes 100,000 children now living in poverty.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of simple justice. This is a matter of promoting family values.

It is time to do something positive for the working poor. Polls show that 75 percent of Americans support raising the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, the time to raise the minimum wage is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, obviously we want to work with the minority to resolve the differences as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I am glad to hear my friend from Pennsylvania say that he is interested in working with the minority to resolve this issue as quickly as possible.

Back in 1948, Harry Truman gave a speech about a do-nothing Congress, and in that speech he said that the Republicans had not created jobs, they had not raised wages, they had not protected pensions, they had not dealt with the health care issue, they had not done a single thing to help working families in America. At the end of the speech Truman looked at the audience and he said, "How many times do you have to get hit over the head before you realize what is hitting you over the head?"

Mr. Speaker, I want to believe my friend from Pennsylvania. He is a noble, decent, hard-working Member of

this body, Mr. GOODLING, but let me tell my colleagues something, I have some difficulty here because we have seen a strategy of delaying, of burying, of ducking on this issue.

Five separate times Republicans blocked an increase in the minimum wage. NEWT GINGRICH said the minimum wage should be based on the wages of workers from Mexico. DICK ARMEY said that he would fight it with every fiber of his being. TOM DELAY said that the minimum wage families do not really exist. And the chairman of the Republican conference said he would commit suicide before he would vote for raising the minimum wage.

So, after all this published pressure in the country forced them to act, the House raised the minimum wage, but only after our friends on this side of the aisle tried to repeal the minimum wage for 10 million workers in this country. So people can understand our trepidation and our fear that this is not going to get done.

Workers in this country are losing these wages on a daily basis, costing literally hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars to these low-income workers in this country today. Twelve million Americans are working hard, they are working long hours.

These are people who are choosing work over welfare, and they cannot raise a family on \$8,800 a year. When they are in that situation, they end up working two jobs and three jobs and overtime.

When a mother is working an extra job, she is not there for her kids in the evening, she is not there to teach them right from wrong, she is not there to read them bedtime stories. When the father has to work two or three jobs or overtime, he is not there for Little League of soccer games. He is not there for dinner conversations. And the whole fabric of civil society starts to come unraveled.

This needs to be done now. It needs to be done before Labor Day. It needs to be done so we can get on with the object of giving America a raise. So I encourage my colleagues to vote for this resolution so we can do this, as the resolution says, as the instructions say, as soon as possible. We do not need to wait another month or two or three before this issue is resolved.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I do that to make sure that everybody understands that nobody was trying to exempt millions of American workers from minimum wage. What we were trying to do is what the other side of the aisle thought they had done in 1989 and thought they had done later, which was to say that there is no difference between interstate and intrastate, because all those workers were already exempt less than 500,000 of them.

What we were trying to do, as I indicated, is make sure that there is no difference between interstate and intrastate, exactly what the minority

thought they had done in 1989. According to the Congressional Research Service, that affected 230,000 people, not 10 million, not 16 million, 230,000, of which I grandfathered all of those so none of them was affected.

Therefore, we cannot say that somehow or other somebody was trying to take away an exemption, because the exemption was already there. All we were trying to do was make sure that we got it the way they wanted it, but it did not work out that way.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman that spoke in the aisle a minute ago said to increase the minimum wage. If my colleagues remember the last time the minimum wage was raised before this, it was raised by Ronald Reagan and the Republicans.

Why, when the Democrats had both the House and the Senate and the White House, if the minimum wage is so important now, did they do nothing? They had control of all three of the areas in which they could have raised the minimum wage and they chose to do nothing. The President even said the minimum wage is not the way to empower people. But now it is important because it is a political year.

No, Mr. Speaker, they do not raise the minimum wage and they talk about a do-nothing Congress. Well, Democrats did a lot of things in the 103d Congress. They increased taxes the highest level ever. They promised a middle-class tax cut and they increased the marginal rate on the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, we tried to live up to that bargain and give money back to the middle class with a \$500 tax deduction to working families for every child, and my Democrat colleagues fought that. Why? Because they want the power and the ability to spend money out of Washington, DC, so they can rain it down to their liberal interest groups, so they can get reelected. That is what is cruel.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues want to help the American people, balance the budget and cut out the extra spending.

Let me give another classic example. In education, the liberals have cut education year after year after year. How? The President's direct lending program cost over a billion dollars more just to administer. One year in operation they have lost \$100 million and they cannot account for it. That is cutting education because those dollars are not going to the classroom.

We took the savings from that and increased Pell grants and increased students loans 50 percent and Democrats said Republicans are cutting education. What we did is we cut their power in River City and we capped the administrative fees on direct lending.

AmeriCorps where it is \$29,000 per volunteer, and in Baltimore it was

\$50,000 per volunteer; the wasteful spending that we have in Washington, DC. If my colleagues want to help American families and get them a minimum wage, then balance the budget and take off interest rates. They will have more money for schools and car loans and home loans and they will have a good life. But no, Democrats want to make it political rhetoric in an election year, when they absolutely refused to do it when they had the total House, the total Senate and they had the White House.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, may I remind all speakers that we are talking about the minimum wage and not some of these other issues that have been brought before us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank our ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this matter of raising minimum wage is a matter of simple justice. We have heard throughout the last year and a half about how important it is for people to work. In fact, we have passed a welfare reform bill, so-called, which will require work because work is an important ethic that ought to be encouraged.

And while we talk about work, we always say work should be rewarded. So we have come now to this legislation which is an attempt to pay fair wages, to make it profitable for people to work at the lowest income in our country.

People who work at minimum wage, \$4.25 now, all they are going to receive after a year is \$5.15 an hour; not much more than what they get, but a substantial amount for those people who are in the lowest income in our society. And I have met many tens of thousands of workers who are earning minimum wage in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I was appalled when once the Labor Department issued the unemployment statistics, everywhere we had been told that the economy was down and that the tax collections were down. And yet at the same time our unemployment figures remained stable. They remained stable because in my community, people have to work three or two jobs just to keep their families together. So when they lose the third job and retain two, they are not unemployed, so it was not reflected in the unemployment statistics, but it certainly was reflected in the amount of money that they had to sustain their families.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to consider the family and the importance of the family, the importance of rewarding work and making people self-sufficient and encouraging this idea of family responsibility, we have to have an increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage is finally going to be a bipartisan bill, but with Republicans and Democrats alike, to my friends on the other side of the aisle who want to troop down here and talk about how Democrats did not do anything the first 2 years of the Clinton administration, I would hasten to remind them of the earned income tax credit which was part of the deficit reduction bill.

Democrats passed that and it gave every American earning under \$26,000 a year a tax cut. It gave 100,000 working West Virginians a tax cut. That was in lieu of the minimum wage and I might add not one Republican Member voted for it. Not one Republican Member voted for that middle-income and lower middle-income working person's tax cut, which, in effect, was a minimum wage increase.

But let us talk about this minimum wage, because it is time for it to go up. The minimum wage has not been raised since 1991, effectively. In West Virginia, what it has meant, failure to raise the minimum wage during the year that it has been talked about has meant \$41 million of lost wages to working West Virginians. It has meant, since July 4, the loss of about \$2 million a week to working West Virginians. That is money not only in their pockets but money that could be circulating in the economy.

Mr. Speaker, it also means that for working West Virginians it means that there are 112,000 payroll jobs that will see an increase because of this minimum wage increase over the next 2 years going from \$4.25 to \$5.15 over a 2-year period.

We talk about welfare reform; this is welfare reform, because what it says is there is value to work. I think that if workers have not had a pay increase since 1991, if they are at minimum wage, their buying power is at an all-time buying low for the last 40 years. If they are now making one-third the average nonsupervisory wage, and the minimum wage used to be one-half of that, yes, it is time for a raise.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us get this to the floor quickly. I am delighted to see there seems to be agreement among Republicans and Democrats. It is time for West Virginians to stop losing \$2 million a week and get that pay raise.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, do we have the right to close on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORKILDSEN). Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman if he intends to call additional speakers.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, whenever the gentleman from Missouri tells me he is down to his last speaker, I will get up and endorse his motion and then yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me 2 minutes. That is all it should take Members of this House to pass this bill. Two minutes. Not 2 months and certainly not 40 years. But for 40 years we have seen the minimum wage constantly have the value eroded down to the point now where we are now talking to folks who are working for minimum wage who cannot afford to exist.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a liveable wage. And it has been more than a month since this House, by a vast majority of its Members, decided to tell the American people, America you deserve a raise. But for more than a month this bill has been held in limbo because of politics. The Senate passed a raise on the wage more than a month ago and we cannot get this out so Americans can finally get their raise.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a need to wait any longer. We need not have an instruction to tell Members of Congress to finally do their work. Let us get to the business of this Congress. Let us increase the wage of American workers who earn the least amount in this country and do some of the hardest work. They have waited a long time. They have had to suffer through this. And quite honestly, it is time for us to tell them we appreciate what they do. And rather than the politics day after day, denying them the opportunity to have a 50 cent increase in their hourly pay, let us get past this political bickering and say it is time to increase the wage of America.

I urge Members to vote for this instruction and let us tell the leadership of the Congress: Fight if you wish, but do not do it on American workers' time. Let us pass this and get it over with and give America what it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, as soon as we cut the rhetoric, we will get this minimum wage conference over.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of raising the minimum wage and I call on the Republican leadership to quit the stalling tactics on this much-needed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, 80 percent of the American public wants to see an increase in the minimum wage. Americans need a raise and the Gingrich Congress has gone to unbelievable lengths to stiff working people, including this morning voting to cut overtime pay for working people. The Republican leadership has employed every parliamentary trick in the book to deny the minimum wage to, deny workers a 90-cent increase. We are talking, friends, about 90 cents.

Under Federal law, Speaker GINGRICH takes home \$171,500 a year in taxpayers' money for his salary. In contrast, the minimum wage worker who puts in 40 hours a week for 52 weeks a year makes a grand total of \$8,840.

On April 17, Speaker GINGRICH promised to, "look at raising the minimum wage." It has been exactly 100 days since Speaker GINGRICH made that promise and the American taxpayers have paid him \$46,989 in that time. And in Connecticut, minimum wage workers lost a total of \$4.8 million in this time in terms of their wages.

Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican revolutionaries passed their Contract With America in the first 100 days of this Congress, but when it comes to working people, the Republican leadership cannot get its act together enough to enact a paltry 90-cent raise. America needs a raise now. Let us do it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I rise just to indicate that I voted for the bill when it left the House. I got some provisions in to protect the most vulnerable who normally are affected. Therefore, as soon as we stop the rhetoric, we will go on to conference and get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my Republican colleagues to stop blocking action on the minimum wage. I have said it before and I will say it again here today: Raising the minimum wage is not just an economic issue, it is a moral issue. It is the right thing to do. The time is always right to do right.

The Republicans in Congress will do anything to deny hard-working people a small raise. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Majority Leader, I know you vowed to fight an increase in the minimum wage with every fiber in your being but you cannot fight the will of the American people forever. Now is the time to act. Now is the time, not tomorrow, not next week, but today. One thing is for sure. Come November, working people will remember.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, America needs a raise; most of America needs a raise. Really, the CEO's are doing very well in America. The stockholders are doing very well. This is a time of prosperity and a great deal of growth. It is time to share the wealth, however.

American workers are stagnated and some are faced with decline in incomes. Here is a small step that we can take. I wish that we could have both Republicans and Democrats resolve between now and the end of this session, at least we will do no more harm to work-

ers than has been done already this year.

□ 1215

The tiny steps that we can take is to move from \$4.25 an hour to the first step in this two-step raise which will be 45 cents a year over a 2-year period, just 90 cents, to move from \$4.25 to \$5.15. What all the economist say, if you factor in inflation and you look at the way that the cost of living has been raised over the last 20 years, we are way behind.

To really stay level with the cost of living, this minimum wage increase should go to something like \$6.30 an hour. So even after we give the two-step increase over a 2-year period, 90 cents to bring it up to \$5.15 an hour, we will still be way behind what we really had 20 years ago with the minimum wage.

This is the least we can do. The war that has been declared on workers this year, starting with the November victory in 1994 of the Republican majority, is an unprecedented war. At least we can call a halt between now and November, try to stake some small steps to communicate to the American people that we do care about working families, that when we talk about moving from welfare to work, we want to make work rewarding. We have taken the rewards out of work by having people who earn the minimum wage earning less than you get if you are on welfare, and in many cases you are better off if you are on welfare and have Medicaid because at least you have a health care plan. Let us end the war on workers and raise the minimum wage without further ado.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, if we wanted to delay the process, we would not have come to the floor to ask to appoint conferees. I might remind my colleagues that it was the senior Senator from Massachusetts that held all of this up over on the Senate side, the appointing of the conferees, not because it had anything to do with the minimum wage but because he did not like something in relationship to health care. That is where the delay has been. We are trying to expedite it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, just to correct the record, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Why do they keep adding these non-germane issues to important issues like the minimum wage? It should not have been there in the first place. That is the problem with what is happening in this 104th Congress under the leadership of the Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania says

that they are not the cause of the delay. I can remember back early on in this year, way back, when we on this side attempted many times to bring up a minimum wage bill and to be thwarted by the votes of the majority, because why? Speaker GINGRICH did not want us to have a minimum wage bill.

Finally, because of some of their Members and some of the Members from people from the media and the public said we have to have a minimum wage, everybody knows that the minimum wage has the lowest buying power that it has had in the last 40 years, so that got to them. So then they finally came up with they want an amendment, though that would have obfuscated most of it, even denied any minimum wage to over 10 million workers. We defeated that. They tried the same thing in the Senate.

This has been a long arduous process, and all because Speaker GINGRICH and DICK ARMEY, they do not want us to have the public, the people out there that work, they do not want them to have a little increase in the minimum wage, 90 cents over a period of 2 years, a 90-cent increase.

Most of my colleagues on the majority side, that would be a hill of beans, does not amount to anything. They would throw that away in 15 minutes without any problem. To people in my district who work for a minimum wage, that 90 cents means a heck of a lot, folks. That means more bread on the table. That means maybe an extra pair of socks for the kids, maybe even a pair of shoes in due time. That is what it means. It does not mean that to the majority, to the wealthy, but it does to those who work for it.

As for me, I worked for a minimum wage at one time. I know what it is like. I do not like it. I do not think anybody on the minimum wage really likes working for the minimum wage. But to have to work for \$4.25 when you should be working for \$5 or \$5.15 makes a big difference.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE].

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to speak today. I have no prepared text. But I get tired of bashing. It is easy for Democrats to bash Republicans, easy for Republicans to bash Democrats. We seem to be in the bashing game.

I was back on the rail, listening to the bashing exercise. I may be wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I think if memory serves correctly, and it does, during the 103d Congress, when my Democrat friends controlled the House, controlled the Senate, controlled the White House at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, not one word was mentioned about minimum wage. They were in the wheelhouse of that ship. My colleagues had control of the ship. But minimum wage was not on their radar screen, my friends. Now all of a sudden it is a hot item and it is the Republicans' fault.

I tire of it, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the American public tires of it and can see through it.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me the time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER].

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused as to what we are debating because we mostly seem to be having a bash Republican session here as opposed to debating the substance. In other words, the House appointed conferees. I think the chairman in the House and the majority in the House are willing to move ahead.

I have differences with what the House did. I actually agree with much of what the Senate is trying to do because I believe, and I get tired of having my motives attacked, I believe that in actuality that the increase in the minimum wage will hurt those who least can afford to be hurt.

I know in inner-city Fort Wayne we have been trying to get a grocery store to relocate back there. We lost all the major downtown grocery stores. This will increase their wage rates basically 20 percent. They already made a market decision that they could not put it there and we are making the market decision more difficult.

In the small town that I grew up and other small towns, the increases in the minimum wage are helping to take very marginal businesses under. We are seeing the Wal-Martization of America because suburbs can afford, through economic growth, to afford a lot of this. We need to look at creative ways, particularly for small businesses to deal with it.

Basically I believe that what we are debating here is not the substance of the minimum wage. We voted and I lost. What we are debating is how to resolve this procedure, how to move the conferees through, how to do it. We are not really resisting the point of trying to get the conference done. The Senators have been holding up the conference.

We want to see it move. As a freshman who has voted on this issue, who is willing to argue this issue, who unlike others have stood up and talked and tried to explain why I voted my vote, I do not retreat from my vote. I realize we have had this argument before.

I just wish that some of rhetoric would be toned down, that the motives attacks would be toned down, and we could move ahead with this process rather than continue what I believe has become malicious bashing of our side.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, one of my many small businessmen in my rural district, he has been in business for 30 years, he has approximately 25 employees. Does the gentleman know what he said? He said, the minimum wage should be increased.

He does not pay the minimum wage. He starts people out at the minimum wage, but he says, people even starting out now at \$4.25 cannot make it.

If the gentleman wants his name, I will be glad to give it to him. His name is Pete Leukenhaus. He has a small business in Wentzville, MO. He believes that it should be increased had, not decreased, not held the same but increased.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I believe every business that can pay more should absolutely pay more. There are many small businesses that are closed that used to pay less, and they cannot make it. That is really what I am talking about.

I would have liked to have seen some sort of adjustments to code to help low-income people who are just starting out, particularly young mothers who are often divorced or single and trying to make it. I would like to look at it. This is not the way.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, since the first week of this month, when the Senate passed the minimum wage bill, Republican delay has cost the gentleman from Indiana's workers, workers in his State, \$5 million a week. I wish he would consider that when he talks about how dangerous the minimum wage is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding me the time.

I have been interested in this debate because Members come in and say, I do not like the bashing, and then they proceed to bash the President, the Democrats or whatever.

Let us stop the bashing. Let us reach that challenge. Let us talk about what is at the core of this debate.

When I went to college, I went to an out of State public university, which meant I was paying out-of-State tuition. I had a job with the minimum wage and, with that job, I made enough money to pay that tuition. Show me where you can do that today.

Let me tell my colleagues, what the real issue is is the minimum wage is lower in value than it has ever been. You are talking about a 40-year low. The minimum wage was supposed to be the floor.

Everybody wants to do welfare reform. Everybody wants to do these kinds of things. But if we cannot have a job where people can sustain themselves, we are really showing how totally coldhearted we are.

I think it is difficult for people who make \$130,000 a year to stand up here and scream about, we do not want to raise the minimum wage. Yet the leadership on the other side of the aisle has said they were going to fight it with every fiber in their body. They were not going to let it go through.

Nevertheless, when we point that out, they say, there you go, bashing. It is not bashing. This is reciting what they have said publicly.

I think it is time we lift the minimum wage. It is way overdue. That will be the biggest incentive to welfare reform.

I think we need to get on with dealing with the real people who keep this country moving. It is particularly necessary for women. A very high percentage of people on the minimum wage are young moms trying to make it for their kids. They are trying to make it for their kids because we have not given them the tough child support enforcement help that they need. Now we are trying to cut off any other kind of support.

Raise the minimum wage. Let us do this together.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds, just to remind everyone that the core of this debate, as a matter of fact, is do we expedite or do we not expedite the conference. That is the only core of this debate. If we stop talking, we will expedite it.

I would just mention that, to the best of my knowledge, to my friend from Missouri, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, I think, is still a Democrat.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to my Democratic colleagues, as the person who actually offered the minimum wage amendment on this floor, that I was joined by 92 other Republicans in voting for that legislation on final passage. The difference is that us 93 Republicans also support meaningful welfare reform. So while on the one hand we do believe that the Federal minimum wage ought to be increased, if not to keep pace with inflation to at least restore some of the purchasing power to the minimum wage that has been lost or eroded due to inflation and to try to reverse this sort of perverse incentive in American society where welfare benefits in the aggregate pay more than the minimum wage job, that is to say, trying to make work more attractive than welfare, trying to make work pay more than welfare, the difference again is that we support raising the minimum wage and reforming welfare.

□ 1230

And I do not believe a single Democratic speaker who has come down to the floor and has been talking on this particular subject, this relatively innocuous motion to instruct conferees, supported welfare reform when they had the opportunity in this Chamber.

Now, the history is quite clear, colleagues. In 1992, candidate Clinton promised to end welfare as we know it. In 1995 and again in 1996 President Clinton vetoed welfare reform. Empty rhetoric spoken with the greatest of sincerity, followed by another broken promise. This cycle repeats itself all too often with President Clinton.

So even though his party, the Democratic Party, controlled the White House and the Congress for the first 2 years of his Presidency, President Clinton did nothing about welfare. He even admitted that when he finally got around to introducing welfare reform legislation, or suggesting welfare reform legislation to this body, it was quite watered down, and as previous speakers have already pointed out, when one controls the House and the Senate, they fail to offer legislation to increase the minimum wage, which seems to sort of undermine their credibility on this particular issue, it has taken a Republican-led Congress to pass legislation to reform welfare as President Clinton promised to do and to increase the minimum wage.

Now, last Thursday we made it possible for President Clinton to again sign on to a serious commonsense welfare reform package. He can either keep his word to end welfare as we know it, and my colleagues can help him do that, or he can do as usual break his word and prove yet again he means little or nothing of what he says. In order, though, for him to keep his word, he is going to have to stand up against the opposition of his party in the House of Representatives and most of the people who have spoken here on this floor today in the last few minutes to the idea of genuine welfare reform. The choice is his.

I ask all of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle to join us in raising the minimum wage and reforming welfare.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may become.

The diversion is becoming an art in this House. The subject today is minimum wage; it is not welfare reform, or capital gains, or a host of other non-germane issues. The gentleman from California who just spoke, workers in his district have lost \$25 million a week since the beginning of this month because of the delay in this bill becoming law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding this time to me. As my colleagues know, this is not Republican bashing or any other kind of bashing. This is simply setting the record straight.

The American people are not fools. They understand that the Democrats in Congress all Congress long have been pushing for an increase in the minimum wage. We could not even get a procedural vote to bring the minimum wage to the floor for months upon months upon months.

The Republican leadership did not want this bill. They finally are here kicking and screaming every inch of the way because they know that 80 percent of the American people support the minimum wage increase and they were on the wrong side of the issue. So they are cutting their losses, and they are reluctantly coming to the table.

But the American people, again, are not fools. They know that the Democratic Party has been pushing it in this Congress.

I do not need history about what happened in previous Congresses. Let us talk about this Congress. This is the Congress that the Republicans have the majority, and this has been to do nothing Republican Congress because it took us so long to finally get the minimum wage to the floor, and we are finally about to pass the minimum wage, but again with 90 Republicans or 92 Republicans, still a majority of Republicans in this Chamber, voted against raising the minimum wage, and a majority of Democrats overwhelmingly supported and voted for the minimum wage. So the American people should understand that. That is what has happened.

We talk about welfare reform. Well, no one is going to get off the minimum wage, get off a minimum wage job or get into a minimum wage job and get off welfare if the minimum wage is not worthwhile, if there is no child care, if there is inadequate health care, and that is the problem with the welfare bill. But we are discussing minimum wage, and it is very clear, very simple. The American people know the Democrats in this Congress have been for increasing the minimum wage time and time again, and Republicans have dragged their feet every step of the way, and again it is consistent with the Republicans attacking working people in this country, being against the minimum wage, being for gutting OSHA and gutting all kinds of rights for workers.

So let us get on and let us pass the minimum wage. This is a victory for the American people.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds just to remind the gentleman from New York again he had 2 years, complete majority in the House, complete majority in the Senate, had the White House, never even mentioned in my committee for 2 years when they had total majority anything about the minimum wage.

But again I say, the senior Senator from Massachusetts delayed appointing in conferees over there, we delayed now about 45 minutes appointing them here. We could get on with the job. All we have to do is name the conferees.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Perhaps the most interesting element in this debate is how one-sided it is. As my colleagues here and I, similar viewers, know, the reason our good friend from Pennsylvania has to stand up and keep granting himself 15 seconds and half a minute is because he cannot get any Republicans to come over here and support him on this, or very, very few, and some who have come over and supported him on it are

actually against the minimum wage and have said so.

Look, the American people understand this. This is a very partisan issue. It has been for almost 60 years. Republicans have been against the minimum wage since it was first created in the late 1930's, and they have been against it each time it has come up since. Oh, if we bring the bill publicly out on the floor, as we have done this afternoon, the Republicans are back in the cloakroom, and if they finally have to vote on it, usually enough of them will join Democrats that we can get it passed.

But Americans are not fooled on this issue. They know that Republicans are against the minimum wage and Democrats are for it. There is another way to put that:

My colleagues remember the economics of the 1980's called trickle-down economics, the new Republican-designed economics called trickle-down. Of course what that was, it is if we can deny income to lower-middle-income and middle-income folks and we can increase the income to the rich and the well-to-do, eventually it will trickle down and help the low-income workers. Democrats are not for that. We are for an economics which we like to call percolate-up. This bill is part of percolate-up: increase the minimum wage so that at the end of the month the workers in this country have a little jingle in their pocket, they go out and spend it, and that is what helps the American economy. It is called percolate-up. It is far different than trickle-down, and there is an enormous difference between Republicans and Democrats on this issue.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, this has been an amazing experience because this is a time in the history of Congress where two-thirds of Congress believes we should move forward in a certain direction where two-thirds of the majority party for very valid reasons disagrees, and this was a test of this Republican Party on whether a minority within the party could have some opportunity to pursue with the minority party on the other side.

I am absolutely convinced that we have been dealing in good faith on this issue. There were other issues in the Senate, like some Member holding up the health care bill, and it seemed logical that that was a bill we wanted because we wanted to deal with the issue of transportability and preexisting condition and the health care fraud positions there and the medical savings accounts and so on, and that bill was being held up by the minority party there, and there were some on our side who said, "Well, if that's the case, then the minimum wage, we're just going to wait on the conference report." But both have been resolved, and we are having a debate now that is somewhat academic because I understand as soon

as the debate is over we will have individuals appointed to the conference committee.

But I just want to, one, thank my leadership for their willingness in my conference and particularly the Members who strongly disagreed because they thought it would and still believe that jobs would be at risk and that profits will be at risk and that prices would be at risk. We disagree, those of us who support raising the minimum wage.

We have a very good debate on the floor of the House. I believe people on both sides of the aisle were dealing in good faith. Two-thirds of this conference wants to move forward on the minimum wage. I think that will happen, and to the credit of this majority party we just did not vote out a minimum-wage package, we voted out a package of economic stimulus tax credits for those individuals who are hiring the least employable. So I think we got a better bill through the synergies that exist.

I recognize that the Democrat Party has been pushing the minimum wage, that they cut a clear majority on their side, they had a role to play in this process. But this side of the aisle, and I do make the point, as has been illustrated, but they did have 2 years when they were in power they could have brought this bill up. And we do understand that there is a lot of politics involved in this process, as well.

But to the credit, we are moving forward, we will see Members appointed to the conference committee, and I urge adoption of this conference effort.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I merely say again we are here to appoint conferees, which that means we want to move ahead, we do not want to delay, but we have lost 50 minutes now. We probably could have solved it all in 50 minutes if we could have just named the conferees and sat down and got in conference, and it may be all over by this time.

But again I know it is a political year. And I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding this time to me. And I might say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania in fact this is an important debate. It is 50 minutes, but I would say to the American people it has been a long time since the Senate passed the minimum wage. I would ask my Republican colleagues, why so long? Why not then, on July 1, and certainly before July 4? Why not recognize that since the Senate passed the minimum-wage increase, American workers, some 5 million of them who earn less than \$4.70, would have already gotten a raise?

According to the Labor Department, if we had gone ahead on July 1, we would have provided the American people 3½ months of groceries, or 4½ months of utility bills or 2 months of rent. My own State of Texas, the workers there have lost \$19 million a week because we did not increase the minimum wage when this House voted for it and the Senate voted for it. Workers have lost nearly \$4 billion because of the Republican delay.

That is why we are debating this on the floor of the House.

And might I take on my colleagues on the issue of welfare reform? I do not mind discussing it, because we are so eager to talk about welfare reform, which I agree with, but at the same time we do not want to give the American workers a decent working wage. I support welfare reform with job training, with child care, with health care and jobs. But I recognize that the fact that we have had a minimum wage that was less than a minimum wage in 1962 in terms of buying power, we are not doing anything to suggest to people get off welfare but yet do not have the jobs or the income to be able to survive, for when one gets off welfare they do still need health care.

This is an important step. I am just so sorry that we did not move more sooner so that the billions of dollars that have been lost already by the American worker could have been corrected, so that more families could buy groceries, so more could pay utility bills, and, yes, those who maybe were without homes could be in apartments now paying rent.

That is really the cause of the ire of those of us on this side of the aisle. We did not need to be voting on this today. We could have been voting for the American worker on July 4, really celebrating this holiday of independence and celebration.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely important that we do move forward. I hope the conferees will spend more time in discussing how we can help the American worker. I hope it will spend time listening to economists who will say that increasing the minimum wage a mere 95 cents does not hurt small businesses, it does help the economy, it does help circulate dollars into the economy so that consumers will have more money. And we recognize that those individuals with the least amount of money are our greater consumers. Give them the opportunity to get a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. Vote for this minimum-wage conference so that we can stand with the Americans. I am sorry it is so late.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of American workers and in support of an increase in the national minimum wage. Every day, we hear how the living standards of Americans are steadily eroding. And finally, we are looking at a bipartisan effort to increase the living standards for millions of Americans who are looking to take personal responsibility and keep them and their families off welfare.

Consider that since the early 1970's, the benefits of economic growth have unevenly distributed among workers. Raising the minimum wage would help ameliorate this trend.

The positive effects of the minimum wage are not felt solely by low-income households, but minimum wage workers are overrepresented in poor and moderate-income households.

Consequently, the minimum wage is an important component of a broad-based policy to help low-wage workers, particularly in households that are working hard to keep themselves and their families in self-sufficiency.

With wages stagnant, people are spending less money. As a result, companies profits are way up and inflation adjusted wages and benefits are climbing at less than half the pace of previous economic expansions.

And with growth in consumer spending down, that means that per capita GDP growth is way below projected trend.

So what does all this mean for you? As many of my colleagues on the other side are seriously considering reductions in the earned income tax credit, workers who are impacted by a stagnant minimum wage are in large part the same people who would be hurt by cuts in the tax credit.

And in this age of personal responsibility, here's the incentive to move out of poverty.

I know that my colleagues vote in favor of this small effort to help hard-working Americans struggle to keep themselves and their families out of poverty. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1245

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORKILDSEN). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 365, nays 26, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 369]

YEAS—365

Abercrombie	Bass	Bonilla
Allard	Bateman	Bonior
Andrews	Becerra	Bono
Archer	Beilenson	Borski
Bachus	Bentsen	Brewster
Baessler	Bereuter	Browder
Baker (CA)	Bilbray	Brown (CA)
Baldacci	Bilirakis	Brown (FL)
Ballenger	Bishop	Brown (OH)
Barcia	Bliley	Brownback
Barrett (NE)	Blute	Bryant (TN)
Barrett (WI)	Boehlert	Bryant (TX)
Bartlett	Boehner	Bunn

Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Galleghy
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood

Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilmer
King
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Metcalfe
Meyers
Millender
McDonald
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinar

Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman

Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh

Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Williams

Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wooldsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—26

Armed
Barr
Barton
Campbell
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Combest
Crane
DeLay

Doolittle
Ehrlich
Goss
Hoekstra
Inglis
Kingston
Kolbe
McIntosh
Royce

Sanford
Shadegg
Souder
Stump
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Walker
Wicker

NOT VOTING—42

Ackerman
Baker (LA)
Berman
Bevil
Blumenauer
Boucher
Chapman
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Cramer
Creameans
Doggett
Ford
Gejdenson

Geren
Hancock
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Holden
Hutchinson
LaHood
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lincoln
Martinez
McDade
Meehan
Mica

Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Nethercutt
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Quillen
Roberts
Scarborough
Seastrand
Studds
Torricelli
Waters
Young (FL)

□ 1304

Messrs. TIAHRT, STUMP ARMEY, DELAY, COMBEST, EHRLICH, INGLIS of South Carolina, DOOLITTLE, WALKER, SANFORD, and GOSS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Messrs. ROYCE, WICKER, CHAMBLISS, BARTON of Texas, and KOLBE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORKILDSEN). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of the House bill, except for title II, and the Senate amendment numbered 1, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ARCHER, CRANE, THOMAS, GIBBONS, and RANGEL.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, for consideration of sections 1704(h)(1)(B) and 1704(l) of the House bill and sections 1421(d), 1442(b), 1442(c), 1451, 1457, 1460(b), 1460(c), 1461, 1465, and 1704(h)(1)(B) of the Senate amendment numbered 1, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GOODLING, FAWELL, BALLENGER, CLAY, and OWENS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, for consideration of title II of the House bill and the Senate amendments numbered 2-6, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GOODLING, FAWELL, BALLENGER, RIGGS, CLAY, OWENS, and HINCHEY.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the distinguished majority whip, for the purpose of asking the schedule for the remainder of this week and for next week.

Mr. DELAY. I thank the distinguished vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has concluded its legislative business for the week.

We will next meet on Monday, July 29, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2 p.m. to consider a slew of suspensions. Members should be advised that any recorded votes ordered will be postponed until Tuesday, July 30, at 2 p.m. Please note that there is a possibility that votes could occur later than 2 p.m., although we cannot guarantee it.

On Tuesday, July 30, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour and at 10 a.m. for legislative business. The House will continue consideration of suspensions before turning to H.R. 2391, the Working Families Flexibility Act.

For Wednesday, July 31 and the balance of the week, the House will debate the following measures, both of which will be subject to rules: H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act; and H.R. 123, English as the Common Language of Government Act.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that a number of conference reports may be ready next week. Among the possibilities the House may consider are welfare reform, health care reform, safe drinking water and, of course, any appropriations bills that are ready.

Mr. Speaker, the House should finish its business and commence the August district work period by 2 p.m. on Friday, August 2.

Mrs. KENNELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to further ask, does the gentleman expect the minimum wage conference report to be considered next week?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentlewoman will yield further, as the gentlewoman knows, the minimum wage portion of the bill is the same in both Houses. We hope after vigorous consultations and negotiations with the Senate through the conference committee that the tax provisions will be worked out and we have every intention of bringing that conference report back to this House for a vote, hopefully in the next week. But the gentlewoman knows as well as I do, conference committees can slow down.

Mrs. KENNELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask a few further questions. Does the gentleman think we will complete the comp time bill next week?

Mr. DELAY. That is certainly our hope and our intention.